I. **INTRODUCTION**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 79-5(f)(3) and 79-5(c)(1), Defendant Under Armour submits this statement in response to Athalonz's Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party's Material Should Be Sealed (Dkt. 29). As set forth herein, the Court should enter an order allowing Under Armour's confidential business material in Athalonz's Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion for De Novo Review to be filed under seal. The limited material to be sealed, identified below, contains sensitive and proprietary business information that Under Armour has an interest in shielding from public disclosure to prevent competitive harm. The information is tangentially related to the merits of the underlying litigation and cannot be protected from public disclosure through less restrictive means.

The limited material to be sealed is as follows:

Document	Portions to Seal	Basis	
Plaintiff's Proposed	Highlighted Portions	Highlighted portions contain confidential	
Supplemental Brief		and proprietary details of Under Armour's	
		products, its design processes, the	
		construction and materials of its products,	
		Mr. Curry's role and feedback on this	
		design, and details of Under Armour's	
		marketing and branding strategy with	
		respect to the Curry products. This	
		information is sensitive and confidential	
		business information that, if made public,	
	could harm Under A		
Exhibit D to Proposed	Entire document	Exhibit D contains confidential and	
Supplemental Brief		proprietary details of Under Armour's	
		products, its design processes, the	
		construction and materials of its products,	
		Mr. Curry's role and feedback on this	
		design, and details of Under Armour's	
		marketing and branding strategy with	
		respect to the Curry products. This	
		information is sensitive and confidential	
		business information that, if made public,	
		could harm Under Armour.	
Exhibit E to Proposed	Entire document	Exhibit E is a confidential photo taken of	
Supplemental Brief		Under Armour employees, Mr. Curry and	
		prototype products and/or presentation	
		materials from a confidential meeting. This	

Document Portions to Seal Basis	Basis	
2 information is sensitive and		
business information that, if	made public,	
could harm Under Armour.		
Exhibit F to Proposed Entire document Exhibit F contains confident		
Supplemental Brief proprietary details of Under products, its design processes		
construction and materials o		
6 Mr. Curry's role and feedba		
design, and details of Under		
marketing and branding stra		
8 respect to the Curry product		
9 information is sensitive and business information that, if		
business information that, if could harm Under Armour.	made public,	
10 Exhibit G to Proposed Entire document Exhibit G is a confidential p	shoto taken of an	
Cumplemental Drief		
11 Supplemental Brief Olider Armour employee, N. prototype products and/or pr	<u>-</u>	
12 materials from a confidentia		
information is sensitive and		
business information that, if	made public,	
14 Exhibit H to Proposed Entire document Exhibit H contains confiden	4i al am d	
15 Supplemental Brief proprietary details of Under products, its design processes		
16 construction and materials o		
Mr. Curry's role and feedba	-	
design, and details of Under		
marketing and branding stra		
respect to the Curry product		
information is sensitive and business information that, if		
20 could harm Under Armour.	made public,	
Exhibit I to Proposed Entire document Exhibit I contains confident	ial meeting	
21 Supplemental Brief notes from design meetings		
22 Armour and Mr. Curry. The		
confidential and proprietary		
Under Armour's products, it	_	
processes, the construction a its products, Mr. Curry's rol		
on this design, and details of		
25 Armour's marketing and bra		
with respect to the Curry pro	oducts. This	
information is sensitive and		
business information that, if	made public,	
28 could harm Under Armour.		

-2-

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Document	Portions to Seal	Basis
Exhibit J to Proposed	Entire document	Exhibit J is a confidential photo taken of an
Supplemental Brief		Under Armour employee, Mr. Curry and a
		prototype product from a confidential
		meeting. This information is sensitive and
		confidential business information that, if
		made public, could harm Under Armour.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Although court filings are presumptively public, "access to judicial records is not absolute." Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). The presumption may be overcome by "compelling reasons" that justify sealing them, such as the need to prevent court filings from serving as "sources of business information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing." Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 598-99 (1978)); see also Apply Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd., 727 F.3d 1214, 1228-29 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ("[W]hile protecting the public's interest in access to the courts, we must remain mindful of the parties' right to access those same courts upon terms which will not unduly harm their competitive interest."). Moreover, this Circuit has "carved out [an] exception" for sealed materials attached to a discovery motion unrelated to the merits of a case. Ctr. for Auto Safety, 809 F.3d at 1097. Under this exception, filings that are tangentially related to the merits may be sealed upon a lesser showing of "good cause." *Id.*; see also Kamakana, 447. F.3d at 1179 ("[T]he public has less of a need for access to court records only to non-dispositive motions because those documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action."). Because the portions of the Opposition to be sealed have no bearing on the resolution of the underlying dispute—a matter of alleged patent infringement—the "good cause" standard should apply. However, should the Court disagree, and instead apply the "compelling" reasons" standard, the result is the same.

27

28

///

///

3

4

67

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

2324

25

26

2728

III. THERE ARE COMPELLING REASONS TO SEAL UNDER ARMOUR'S CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

The materials to be sealed are limited to Under Armour's "confidential business material, marketing strategies, [and] product development plans" which, if disclosed, "could result in improper use by business competitors seeking to replicate [Under Armour's] business practices and circumvent the time and resources necessary in developing their own practices and strategies." Roley v. Google LLC, 2020 WL 13517498, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2020) (quoting Algarin v. Maybelline, LLC, 2014 WL 690410, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2014)). More specifically, the materials to be sealed consists of: (1) confidential notes from design meetings between Under Armour employees and Stephen Curry, which include proprietary details of Under Armour's products and prototype products, its design processes, and branding strategies; and (2) confidential photos taken of the participants, prototype products and/or materials from these confidential meetings. Under Armour does not share its business secrets with the public or with its competitors, and if competitors were to obtain this information, they would gain improper insight into Under Armour's strategic thinking and design process. Synchronoss Techs., Inc. v. Dropbox Inc., 2018 WL 6002319, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2018) (noting that courts have sealed confidential business information when it "prevent[ed] competitors from gaining insight into the parties' business model and strategy") (citing In re Qualcomm Litig., 2017 WL 5176922, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2017)); Gomo v. NetApp, Inc., 2019 WL 1170775 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2019) (sealing "non-public meeting minutes and materials from ... [those] meetings; correspondence regarding those meetings; records of a private meeting..." and the like); Bauer Bros. LLC v. Nike, Inc., 2012 WL 1899838, at *2 (S.D. Cal. May 24, 2012) (concluding that "public disclosure of Nike's confidential business materials . . . could result in improper use by business competitors seeking to replicate Nike's business practices and circumvent the considerable time and resources necessary in product and marketing development").

Additionally, allowing public access to the private meetings between Under Armour and Mr. Curry—whose celebrity status makes the records even more sensitive—would undermine

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28 reasons sufficient to outweigh the public's interest in disclosure and justify sealing ... exist when such court filings might have become a vehicle for improper purposes such as ... promote public scandal."). Carefully curated athletic sponsorships are vital to Under Armour's business, the confidentiality of which provides Under Armour with a unique competitive advantage. As such, it is necessary for Under Armour to maintain privacy in its dealings with professional athletes, whose business affairs are generally not made available for public consumption. Mr. Curry and Under Armour expect these meeting to be a private exchange of information for business purposes between the parties and that the information exchanged would not be disclosed to a larger audience. The documents should be filed under seal to protect the continued freedom of these exchanges for that process. Moreover, disclosure could result in harm to other current and potential future athletic sponsorships, given professional athletes rely upon Under Armour to maintain the confidentiality of their business affairs. Any public interest in disclosing the redacted information is outweighed by the prejudice that will result to Under Armour and Mr. Curry, a non-party that "did not voluntarily put [his private business dealings] at issue in this litigation," if no protection is granted. United States v. Bazaarvoice, 2014 WL 11297188, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2014). Finally, there is no less restrictive alternative to sealing the information described above.

There is no way to seal less while still protecting the confidential information at issue, nor is there any way to avoid competitive harm through an alternative to sealing. Likewise, any countervailing public interest in the disclosure of the information at issue is minimal, and far outweighed by the prejudice that Under Armour would suffer if its commercially sensitive information were publicly disclosed.

IV. **CONCLUSION**

For these reasons, Under Armour respectfully requests that the Court grant Athalonz's Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party's Materials Should Be Sealed and maintain under seal Under Armour's confidential information listed in the chart above.

	Case 3:23-mc-80324-LJC	Document 34	Filed 04/23/24	Page 7 of 7	
1	Dated: April 23, 2024	VENABLE LLP			
2		By: /s/ William A. Hector			
3			William A. Hector (SBN 298490) Frank C. Cimino, Jr. (pro hac vice)		
4			Megan S. Woodworth (pro hac forthcoming) Robert E. Bugg (pro hac forthcoming)		
5					
6			Attorneys for Defendant UNDER ARMOUR, INC.		
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
2122					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
			-6-		